

Siuslaw Estuary Partnership

An Integrated Multiple Objective Approach To Watershed Protection and Restoration

Community Stakeholder Group February 24, 2011 Meeting Notes DRAFT 3/24/11

Thursday February 24, 2011
5:00 – 7:30 p.m.
Florence City Hall
250 Highway 101, Florence

Present (except where noted absent):

Stakeholders: Adele Dawson, Lane County Audubon Society & Local Birding (absent); Rob Shepherd, Florence Board of Realtors (absent); Lisa Walter-Sedlacek, Florence Area Chamber of Commerce; David Huntington, Recreational Fishing (absent); Mark Tilton, Florence Planning Commissioner; Clarence Lysdale, Recreation-Kayak and SCUBA; Nancy Nichols, Lane County Planning Commissioner; Anne Caples and Sue Noble, Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition; Bill Hennig, Salmon Trout Enhancement Project; Gus Gates, Surfrider; Jean White, Volkswalkers; Tiffany Rogato, Florence Area Hospitality Association.

City of Florence Staff (City): Wendy Farley, Senior Planner; Sandra Belson, Community Development Director, Project Manager; Carol Heinkel, Planning Consultant, Project Coordinator; Mike Miller, Public Works Director.

Inter-disciplinary Team Members: Liz Vollmer-Buhl, Siuslaw Watershed Council Coordinator/Executive Director.

Guests: Tom Steinberg, Siuslaw Watershed Council Leadership Board

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Project Overview (Hand-out)

Wendy welcomed the group to the meeting and asked the group to introduce themselves. Wendy handed out a "Products and Timeline Chart" and went over each of the different products and their anticipated milestone dates. She asked if there were any questions.

Some members said they had trouble opening or downloading the agenda attachments using the links on the agenda. Others said they did also, but were successful after several tries. Sandra asked if they tried to go directly to the web site: www.siuslawwaters.org. Members said they would try that next time. Wendy and Carol said they would check with the server since it sounds like a timing problem in that some members could open the attachments some of the time and not other times. Staff offered that if this occurs with the next agenda packet, that members should first go to the applicable page on the web site, i.e., Wetlands Page for wetlands maps, and open

the attachments directly from the web site; and, if that fails to let Wendy know as soon as possible and staff would make sure they all get the attachments.

2. Agenda Review and April 29, 2010 Meeting Notes (Attachments)

Carol went over the agenda and noted that the meeting notes were in their packets (note: the notes had already been reviewed and edited via email after the last Stakeholder Meeting). She asked if the agenda was ok and if there were any requested changes. No changes were requested.

3. Public Comment

Carol explained that 5 minutes is allotted on each agenda for public comments on the Siuslaw Estuary Partnership Project and that, for any extended comment, the group encourages the public to provide those in writing in advance of the meeting so the Group has a chance to review them.

Carol asked if there were any members of the public who wished to comment. No one did.

4. Climate Change Report Draft 2/17/11 (Attachment)

Carol gave a brief summary of the draft report and the key issues. She said that the Interdisciplinary Team started working on the report in October and that there have been several versions of the draft since then. The reason for this is because the sources relied upon are constantly in flux. For example, the two main sources relied upon in the last draft for the locally-relevant information were completely replaced in December with the Oregon Climate Change Adaptation Framework; and the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute came out with the first Oregon Climate Change Assessment Report in December. She said the good news is that these recent reports contain much more detail that is relevant to Oregon and, although more limited, information relevant to the Florence area. She said getting information relevant to Florence was the greatest challenge in writing this because there has been very little study of the Florence area specifically.

She walked the Group through each of the Key Issues and Potential Strategies in the Executive Summary and asked if they had any comments. Clarence said he read the entire report and that, with everything in flux, it is hard to say anything definitive, but that the report does a good job of reporting what information is out there that is relevant to Florence and he especially liked the Potential Strategies. Mark said he thinks Climate Change needs to be included in all of the plans.

Nancy asked if the report addressed ocean acidification because she believes that is an especially important aspect of Climate Change. Carol referred her to page 16 of the report where this topic is briefly addressed. Carol said the team agrees it is an important topic but that it was not included under key issues for Florence because it did not seem

directly related to the study area for this project, although there could be connections that the team has not considered.

Carol asked if others had questions or comments; she asked if they had had a chance to read the report. Many members said they did not have a chance to read the report. Carol offered that the comment period could be extended to March 11 and any comments submitted by then to her would be addressed in the next draft of the report. The Group agreed to provide additional comments to Carol via email by March 11.

5. Siuslaw Estuary Trail Vision: Location and Design Options, Stakeholder Review Draft 2/17/2011 (Attachment)

Wendy described the report and the process for developing it. She said the Public Education and Stewardship Team directed that a Technical Team be formed that included the state and federal agencies whose sign-off on the trail is necessary so that any potential obstacles could be addressed at the outset rather than later in the process. She read the list of the agencies the team members represented with the key permitting agencies being the Department of State Lands, Department of Land Conservation and Development, US Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife. She said their buy-in on the vision is critical because if they support the vision, that will help facilitate approval of state and federal permits in getting it on the ground. She said Sally Owens, Port Commissioner, also participated because of the key role the Port and the Port's property plays in the trail. She said the preferred options presented in the report are the options that the entire Technical Team supported. She said she also met with all of the property owners affected by the options and they agreed to include their property in the vision report.

Wendy said the Policy Analysis in the report was done in order to ensure that there are no local policies or codes that would prevent the trail from locating as shown in the preferred options. Carol said she helped Wendy with the Policy Analysis and that, based on their review, there were no local policy obstacles to the preferred options. She said the key is that the trail is a water-related use for educational observation that will not alter, reduce, or degrade estuarine resources and values; and thus it meets the priorities and requirements of Statewide Planning Goals 16 and 17. She said the state and federal agencies have similar requirements when it comes to the estuary; that upland is preferred and, when upland is not possible, that the trail be in the estuary in a manner that minimizes the extent and the impact on the estuary.

Wendy handed out four graphics that showed the four sections of the trail that were in the original options presented to the Technical Team. She said the Technical Team walked the entire length of the trail together, where access allowed, and discussed the options. She walked the Group through each section and relayed the discussion by the Team and their reasons for their preferred options.

Wendy said the Dredged Materials Disposal (DMD) Site was discussed. She said that the team preferred for the constructed walkway to continue upland along the edge of the

Port's campground, behind the DMD Site, and, in addition, for a signed, natural, footpath to loop around the Site into the estuary at this location. She said this portion of the trail, the footpath, is owned by Don Saxon. In response to a question, Carol said the Department of State Lands and US Army Corps of Engineers held that a constructed walkway surface in the estuary itself at this spot would have too much impact on the tidal wetlands located there; and that trail users who are willing to trek down the footpath will get the full experience of the estuary at this spot, particularly with interpretive signage along the route. Wendy said there is a well worn footpath at this spot today. Carol pointed out that the DMD Site is a hill for a short distance and the estuary is briefly out of sight where the walkway extends along the back of it. Wendy said that the Dredged Disposal Plan and state law does not allow the DMD Site to be altered or used for an observation platform or a trail. For this reason, the state and federal agencies held that a footpath in the estuary would most likely meet their criteria, i.e., that no alternative upland location is feasible and the footpath would minimize impacts on the estuary.

Wendy went on to explain that an elevated walkway on pilings was preferred to connect the former Middle School property to the trail at the mouth of Munsel Creek, provided that findings can be made that no upland location is feasible. She said the issue here is that the upland portion of the trail in this location would have to be located along the back yards of private homes. If that is not feasible, the elevated walkway in this location would be necessary because the estuary here is high marsh and too wet for a footpath. The elevated walkway, if allowed, would be a highlight of the trail; the views of the estuary at this spot are stunning.

Wendy said that the trail then would connect with the riparian area along the west side of Munsel Creek through forested wetlands. She said this riparian area is quite pretty and visible from Highway 126.

Wendy said there is an undersized culvert under Highway 126 at this spot and that reconstructing the culvert and constructing a bridge or tunnel for pedestrians was preferred.

Bill said he recognized that the trail where it connects with Highway 126 would need a bridge because it is tidal at the culvert and a bridge would be needed because the water may be too high at high tides for a pedestrian path below. Sandra said it might be ok to have tidal influence at some times if it is not too frequent. Nancy pointed out that it is recreational, not a commuter route; and, thus it might be ok if access is blocked part of the time, as long as it is not too often. Wendy said that signage announcing the possibility of tidal influence could be incorporated into an under-highway design as a safety precaution.

Clarence said that engineering would determine the best solution. Bill said it might be possible to build a path at high elevation. Wendy said the design elements would be worked out in the next Phase of the project.

Bill commented that the culvert is indeed too small; he said it has had to be cleaned out three times so far this year because it was plugged. Sandra said she researched this and found that when ODOT replaced the bridge over the creek, they did not modify the existing culvert because that would have expanded the scope, and the expense, of the project. Sandra said she believed it would be many years before ODOT would get the culvert fixed; in terms of process, the project would need to get into the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) and then appropriated funding and this would be just one project among many prioritized in the statewide list.

Liz asked Wendy if the work of the UO graduate student on the conceptual trail designs for the Siuslaw Water Trail and Estuary Trail addressed a couple of the questions. Wendy has a copy of that work.

The team commented that they liked the trail and the manner in which Wendy presented the preferred options. They agreed that the report could be forwarded, as is, to the next step which is review and comments by the Elected Officials Stakeholder Group.

6. Community Involvement Events and Opportunities (Attachments)

Wendy walked the Group through the Public Involvement Plan Implementation Sheet that was included in their packets. She said the highlights are the newsletter which will be sent out in early April and the Open House which is scheduled for April 25 from 4-7 pm. She asked the Group to mark that date and time on their calendars. She said the newsletter will be coming to them in some form at their March 31 meeting.

Lisa asked who would be putting the newsletter together. Wendy said it was prepared by the staff team last time; there really wasn't funding for a graphics firm to put it together. Lisa said she would like to see this newsletter be more eye catching and that it be used to get people excited about the project. She said it should focus more on what people care about – birding, the estuary trail, etc. She said it should have local pictures and graphics; not the water cycle which she did not care for.

Carol pointed out that these are excellent comments and that is precisely the kind of input staff is looking for in the next agenda item, Key Messages. She asked if it was ok to put those comments up as part of that discussion; the Group agreed.

Wendy continued to brief the Group on the overall public involvement plan. She said another critical involvement piece is the stakeholder meetings. She said originally staff proposed the two Stakeholder Groups meet on March 17 but that they have heard there is a conflict with that date. She said the Elected Official Stakeholders can meet on April 11, which is a Monday, and asked if the Community Stakeholders could meet that same night at 5:00. The Group agreed that April 11 would work.

Gus asked what the agenda items would be for the next meetings of the Group. Carol said that question is the last agenda item on tonight's agenda. The Group will be asked

if the agenda items that make sense at the end of this meeting are the ones to be on the next meeting's agenda.

■ **EPA Visit** Sandra Belson

Sandra said a contingency of staff from the EPA are planning to visit Florence to learn first hand about the project. That visit is planned for April 25 and 26, to coincide with the Open House. She said she knows that EPA will be very interested to hear from all of them what your thoughts are about the project and this is an excellent opportunity for them to interact with EPA, not just about this project, but about future needs that relate to the outcomes of this project; such as future funding for the estuary trail and water monitoring program.

■ **Student Workshops and Stewardship Opportunities**

Wendy said the SEP was about public education and also stewardship. She handed out the Program Summary for the Student Workshops and Field Trips with the Middle School 8th Grade Science Class. She said that this involved one day-long in-class workshops (5) and two days in the field doing restoration and exploration. She briefly went over the different activities and topics covered. She said follow-up is planned in the way of a restoration workshop for adults on April 12 and that there will be a youth component to that as well. She said that it would be a SOLV project – Stop Oregon Litter and Vandalism.

She said if the Group knows of other stewardship opportunities, to please let her know and she will help get the word out, for example, by including them on the web site. Carol offered that one way the Group can help get the word out about the April 25 Open House is to advertise it in their publications and on their web sites. She asked if members would be willing to put a link to the project on their web sites as well. Tiffany said she will do a link and also help with getting the date out there in two publications.

7. Brainstorm Key Messages

Carol said the purpose of this agenda item is for the Group to share ideas on important public messages about the project. She said the Group did the same thing last year and their messages were conveyed in outreach materials such as the web site, the newsletter, the hand-outs and presentations at the Open House, and other communications. She said now that the project is in a new phase, staff wants to hear from them on important messages to convey this time around.

She listed the five project elements at the top of the flip chart pad: Public Education and Stewardship; Water Quality and Quantity; Wetlands and Riparian Areas; Key Estuary Wetlands; and Ecological Growth (like Sustainability). She said they can say any key message that comes to mind and that this list might help jog their thoughts on some areas to address.

The Group then went around the table and one by one they offered key messages. These were recorded on the flip chart and are attached to these meeting notes.

8. Information Items and Update Reports:

Carol said this agenda item was for brief staff updates on all of the project elements. She said these are not discussion items and so there is not an expectation that all members would have been able to review the materials in advance of the meeting.

■ *Endorsed Guiding Principles (Attachment)*

Sandra said the Guiding Principles that the Stakeholders worked on last year have now been endorsed by all partners and that the Port opted not to endorse them. In response to a question, Sandra said the reason the Port did not choose to endorse them is because they were concerned that the Guiding Principles could become restrictions on what people can do to an unnecessary level, but that they supported the project overall and the trail and are partnering with the City on that project. She said part of the issue may be that the representative from the Port on the Elected Official Stakeholder Group changed and that the Port was thus not as involved in developing the Guiding Principles as other members had been.

■ Water Monitoring Program Status Reports (Attachments)

Mike said the City has now done several rounds of monitoring – both surface water and groundwater – and the next round will be for all constituents. He said they missed one sampling in Ackerley Creek because they saw coho and steelhead in one of the artificial gravel beds and they (fish) had spawned.

He said the groundwater testing has been interesting. He said at well B2, on the west side of Harbor Vista and Rhody, there was a lot of sediment out of that well and high levels of nitrates – 28-29 parts per million (ppm) which is way over the threshold limit of 5 ppm. He said it also had *E coli* at one of the testings. They tested again in January and there was no *E coli* and he is thinking the rainfall has dissipated the nitrates. This means we need to keep monitoring to see how rainfall impacts the trend line and continue to collect data. He said 3 or 4 additional wells will be added in March and they are deciding now on locations. They are considering North Jetty Road, Rhody, Harbor Vista Park entrance and Heceta Beach Road. He said the Harbor Vista park area was in the original plan but did not get a response from the County before drilling the monitoring wells. If a new well is located within the county right-of-way on North Jetty Road then a county facilities permit is needed. If we decide to place the well within the entrance to the park then an IGA between the City and County is needed to place a well on park property. He said the hospital site also tested positive for *E coli* early on and it has not since; he is not sure why. He said there were no nitrates in the latest sampling, due to the heavy rainfall events. He said it takes a lot of data sets collected over a long period of time to do trending and the monitoring program has just begun.

Mike said GSI has been able to track groundwater levels and that all the sites have been surveyed. He said they know within 6 inches of true elevation and have good information on where the aquifer lies, how high it is, and that is going to be really good information. He said he expects to have results summarized by the end of March.

He said he has 17-18 coolers of water sample bottles at the shop to take to the lab. Nancy asked if the monitoring reports were public knowledge and if so are people checking them every time? Mike said yes they are public and they are on the web site and the team gets all the reports (the Team includes Heceta Water District). He said there really isn't much to say about it because we really don't know what is going on until we do more testing and collect more results.

- **Aquifer Protection Plan Work Plan (Attachment)**

Mike said the team approached the state to expand the Source Water Protection Plan to be an Aquifer Protection Plan that will address all of the water monitoring results – surface and groundwater, and will be used to determine where future water sources will be. He said the goal is to have it be more broad. The state has agreed to using this approach.

- *Florence Stormwater Design Manual (Attachment)*

Mike said the City Council accepted this manual and that staff are now preparing draft changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Code to implement it. He said the City has been relying on the Portland Stormwater Manual which they found has not worked well in all aspects of the Florence environment. He said the new manual has designs for smaller projects and that larger projects will need to be engineered; and that the manual recognizes the uniqueness of the Florence area with its high water table and other characteristics.

In answer to a question from Lisa, Mike explained that post development flows still cannot exceed pre-development flows, as in the existing City policy, but the manner in which that occurs has been outlined to work specifically for Florence.

Lisa said she is excited about the manual and asked what notice the City gave to the public about this process. Mike said that the public process started in August 2010 when he brought an early draft of the manual to City Council for their input, comments and questions. During that meeting the Council directed staff to create a stakeholder group that included representatives of specific groups in the development community, such as landscapers, engineers, developers, etc. and hold a meeting with them to get their input. He said that a community open house/stakeholder meeting took place on October 27. He said he did a direct mailing to all of these groups, including interested parties and that only a few showed up but they had excellent input that helped shape the manual. Addition, written comments were received from a developer and consulting engineer. In regards to getting input on the plant listing, Mike said that the engineering consultants attempted to contact her (Lisa) directly to get her input. Absent of

contacting her, he did contact OSU extension service and they provided a statewide plant listing for rain gardens. *Please note: after the meeting, staff further researched this question and were reminded that the Community Stakeholders were informed about the Council's direction regarding the stakeholder meeting in the monthly email Project Update; that the date and the process were listed on the Home Page of the project web site and the City web site, and described in detail, with the Draft Manual, on both web sites for about a month prior to the meeting. Please control click this link to view the slide presentation on the manual:*

http://www.siuslawwaters.org/shop/images/stormwater_design_manual_council_presentation_12_6

■ *Stormwater Demonstration Site*

Mike said the big news is that the City has purchased the Barnett property on Bay Street. He said they closed on it in November and have gotten reimbursed by the State because it is part of the Scenic Byways Project (Federal Highways project). Staff are now working on getting everything in order for the public process including final design and are trying to shoot for the December 2011 in-water work window; he said that is the goal and if they don't make that, they will need to go to the December 2012 in-water work window.

■ *Key Estuary Wetlands*

Liz gave a brief update on the Key Estuary Wetlands portion of the SEP. Work on the estuary (tidal) wetlands is funded primarily through other funding sources and receives a small amount of funding from the SEP project. She went over PowerPoint slides she handed out (attached). Liz reviewed the phases of work to be accomplished on the Waite Ranch site, the winter 2010 acquisition of the site by McKenzie River Trust, and the status of the preliminary assessment work that had been accomplished thus far. She also reviewed the phases of work and status of the development of the management plan at the North Fork Marsh site. Liz referred the Group to the Siuslaw Watershed Council web site and/or SWC meetings for more information.

■ *Wetlands and Riparian Areas (Attachments)*

Sandra gave an update on the wetlands inventory; she said the inventory is now complete and the maps are posted to the web site. She said we need to decide on criteria for determining significance; she said that will be a topic for public comment.

Clarence is working on the riparian inventory. He described the inventory and protection options. He said the staff team discussed the options and ways to measure and protect valuable riparian areas. He said Munsel Creek goes up to the lakes and there are lots of riparian areas around the lakes. He is now fine tuning the reach descriptions and fully describing the inventory.

9. Sum Up and Next Meeting Agenda Topics

Next Meetings: March 31, 2011, 5:00-6:20 p.m.
Monday, April 11, 5:00-6:20 p.m.

Next Meeting Agenda Topics:

- Draft Newsletter
- Revised Draft Climate Change Report
- Wetlands Significance Criteria
- Targeted Outreach for the April 25 Open House

10. Adjourn**Key Dates:**

- Monday, April 25, 2011: Public Open House, Florence Events Center, 4:00-7:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS TO MEETING NOTES:

- Key Messages, 2-24-11
- Program Summary: Student Workshops and Exploration/Restoration Field Trips
- Key Estuary Wetlands Slides Printout

This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under assistance agreement WC-00J04801-0 to City of Florence. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

KEY MESSAGES

Community Stakeholders' Meeting February 24, 2011

1. Promote ownership so that people and the public have ownership, not just the stakeholders. Make the public feel they are part of it; not like a government program is "coming at them."
2. Make it actionable for people in their daily lives. What are 10 things I can do to lessen my impact on the environment? Help them understand that their individual efforts collectively can have a significant impact.
3. Map of the Estuary Trail: include this in the newsletter and make it attractive and easy to understand and visualize. Make it real for people; not abstract. If there are choices, show those too.
4. Highlight that one of the things we are doing is preparing for Climate Change. This is a major theme that touches all the project elements. Link this to people's individual actions, such as reducing water consumption, planting trees, etc.
5. Show how the estuary might move with climate change. Use GIS to simulate possible scenarios; and/or check with the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute to see if they can prepare a graphic or slide to show this.
6. Look at the 50 year projection of sea level rise.
7. Wetlands and riparian areas – significant – warn people of how these regulations might affect them; help them to pay attention – get their attention, as early on as possible.
8. There are good reasons to keep plants along waterways – tell people what they are.
9. Options for what values to protect and what wetlands to protect for those values.
10. On-going community engagement is critical.
11. Make the newsletter interesting to most people. Keep it simple. Show the Waite site.
12. Estuary is important, although it might not be spectacular; encourage people to get out in the estuary.
13. How do we make it interesting? People know its there; may not know why its important and what it does.
14. 10 hints – list one or 2 ideas of what you can do.

15. Make the newsletter bigger?
16. Put little bits of information in the newsletter and direct them to the web site for more information.
17. Not so many words – more pictures. Just give a list – tell them how they can get involved.
18. Little enough print – big print – on front page so you will open it up.
19. Have an art contest for kids – and adults- a logo contest? Turn it into a calendar.
20. Livability – it is a good economic thing for the town – ecotourism – protecting riparian function – show how it increases property values.
21. Facebook page?
22. City TV station – can project get exposure there? The PC and CC meetings: make a slide show so that it has text with photos and show it before the meetings start and at the end.
23. Green Fair April 2: getting lots of press; tag on to that; have a table there; keep a slide show running.

Student Workshop Program Summary

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Location: Siuslaw Middle School, 2525 Oak Street, 541-997-8241
North of Hwy 126, West of Hwy 101, SW corner of 27th and Oak St.
Main parking lot and front office are off Oak St. south of 25th St.

Time Schedule: Students rotate through five sessions in groups of 22

Set up — 9:20 — 10:04
Session 1 — 10:08 — 10:53
Session 2 — 10:57 — 11:42
Lunch — 11:43 — 12:50
Session 3 — 12:54 — 1:39
Session 4 — 1:43 — 2:28
Session 5 — 2:32 — 3:15

Workshop Stations:

➤ **Introduction to Plant and Animal Diversity in Siuslaw Estuary**

Staff: Mizu Burruss, Siuslaw Watershed Council

Topic: Overview of the subsystems in Oregon estuaries: Marine, bay, slough, & riverine. Discussion and activity detailing the plant and animal life dependent on the different subsystems and zones within those subsystems.

➤ **Groundwater Stewardship: Understanding and Protecting the North Florence Dunal Aquifer**

Staff: Suzanne Moellendorf and Dave Livesay, GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
Jacquie Fern, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Topic: Overview of the hydrologic cycle; groundwater formation and flow; aquifer recharge; interactions between groundwater and surface water; how common activities can contaminate or deplete water, and ways to prevent this. This session consists of interactive groundwater and watershed models to demonstrate processes and generate discussion.

Workshop Stations Cont':

➤ **The Importance of Estuaries and the Role of the Siuslaw Estuary Partnership Project Station**

Staff: Sandra Belson, City of Florence and SEP Project Manager

Topic: Siuslaw Estuary Partnership Project Overview.
Video—*Estuaries: Oregon's Coastal Treasures*. What they are, why they are important, and the functions they serve.

➤ **Invasives Media Madness**

Staff: Tania Siemens and Amanda Slade, Oregon Sea Grant Extension

Topic: Students will engage in media madness to raise awareness about invasive species. Students will form teams to RAPIDLY develop and perform a 60 second commercial that shares important messages about invasive species that they think the public should know. The skits will be peer evaluated based on whether they think the skits will actually cause the public to take action. The winning skit will receive a prize and be posted on You Tube.

➤ **The Role of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians (CTCLUSI) in Estuary Protection-Seven Generations of Stewardship**

Staff: Jesse Beers, Cultural Director, CTCLUSI
John Herbst, Environmental Specialist, CTCLUSI

Topic: A small glimpse into the mind frame and culture of the CTCLUSI and how they interplay, relate, and are dependent on the health of the lands and waters in which they have always been and will always remain.

Student Exploration and Restoration Fieldtrip Program Summary

Tuesday & Wednesday, February 22 & 23, 2011

Schedule:

Tuesday February 22

9:00 Students arrive at Port, get into hip boots & divide into groups
9:30-10:15 In Water Exploration (Low tide 10:00)
10:20-10:45 History & Biology (10-12 minutes apiece)
10:45-11:15 Wetlands
11:15-11:25 Snack, Restroom, & Boot Removal
11:25-12:40 Restoration (Invasive Plant Removal at Port)
12:40-1:00 Lunch (at Port Site)
1:00-1:10 Load Bus and Travel
1:10-2:10 Storm Water/Waste Water
2:15 Students Return to School by 2:30

Wednesday February 23

9:00 Students arrive at Port, get into hip boots, & divide into groups
9:30-9:55 History & Biology (10-12 minutes apiece)
10:00-10:30 Wetlands
10:30-11:20 In Water Exploration (Low tide 11:00)
11:20-11:35 Snack, Restroom, & Boot Removal
11:40-1:00 Restoration (Invasive Plant Removal at Port)
1:00-1:20 Lunch (at Middle School Site)
1:20-1:30 Load Bus and Travel
1:30-2:15 Storm Water/Waste Water
2:20 Students Return to School by 2:30

Field Stations:

- **In Water Exploration:** Students will walk to “the island” then divide into 5 groups or so. Leaders will “Walk and Talk” about anything from fish to birds to clams to shrimp (whatever the leader knows something about); the main idea is to explore the actual estuary. Bring a shovel, shrimp gun etc.... Adult hip waders provided by USFS.

Time: 22nd-9:30-10:15, Low tide is .3 and at 10:00
23rd-10:30-11:20, Low tide is .1 and at 11:00

Staff:

Group Leads: Seth Mead, Scott Salisbury, Caleb Mentzer, 22nd only--John Spangler, Brian Hudson, & Mizu Burrell, 23rd only--Suzanne Moellendorf & Jeff Jones

Assists: Jim Grano, Wendy Farley, Alexis Wells, Matt Ternyik, Anna Buckley

Tentative: Lynn Hood, Ray Kinney, Jesse Beers, Fuzzy Gates

- **Wetlands Exploration:** On the 22nd students will divide into 2 groups of approximately 25. On the 23rd students will divide into 3 groups of approximately 18. Leaders will “Walk and Talk” about estuary plants and their habitat. Other adults will assist.

Time: 22nd-10:45-11:15 & 23rd-10:00-10:30

Staff: Anna Buckley & Matt Ternyik, Suzanne Moellendorf (23rd)

- **History & General Biology:** Students will divide into 2 groups of approximately 25. Leaders will “Walk and Talk” about historic use of the river and general river-related biology. Other adults will assist.

Time: 22nd-10:20-10:45 & 23rd-9:30-9:55

Staff: Brian Hudson (22nd) Suzanne Moellendorf (23rd)

- **Restoration:** Students will divide into groups of 3-5 with an adult leader and target pre-selected areas for invasive plant species removal. 22nd-Scotch Broom, Port site, no travel required. 23rd-Scotch broom and English Ivy on the Old Middle School Site, 5 minute travel required. Bring loppers, hand saw, & gloves if you have them.

Time: 22nd-11:25-12:40 & 23rd-11:40-1:00

Staff: Jim Grano, Wendy Farley-Campbell, JR Herbst

Assists: Alexis Wells, chaperones

Tentative: Jesse Beers

- **Stormwater & Wastewater:** All 55 students will load onto the bus and visit the stormwater demonstration site in Old Town and then continue to other water or waste water treatment sites.

Time: 22nd-1:10-2:10 & 23rd-1:30-2:15

Staff: Mike Miller and/or Dan Graber

Key Estuary Wetlands Project Slides



Key Estuary Wetlands Protection and Restoration

- Site A—Waite Ranch:
 - Phase I: Property acquisition; Preliminary site assessment (SEP, WWRI, ODFW, OWEB)
 - Phase II: Site analysis, restoration feasibility, planning, design & environmental permitting
 - Phase III: Levee and tidegate removal implementation (construction)
 - Phase IV: Post-construction monitoring and research



Key Estuary Wetlands Protection and Restoration

Site A—Waite Ranch:

- Phase I: Property acquisition; Preliminary site assessment (SEP, WWRI, ODFW, OWEB)
 - McKenzie River Trust (MRT) has acquired Waite Ranch!
- Preliminary Site Assessment Continues:
 - River channel profiles adjacent to Waite
 - Water level and barometric pressure data
 - Communication with tidal hydrologists
 - Elevation survey
 - Infrastructure information



Key Estuary Wetlands Protection and Restoration

- Site B: North Fork Marsh
 - 2009: MRT Acquired
 - 2010: Baseline Inventories and Develop Management Plan
 - Baseline Inventories Done
 - Maps Created for Management Planning
 - Management Plan Drafts under review

